



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,599	08/13/2001	Lee Anne Kowalski	SVL920010049US1	7529
22462	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/928,599

Applicant(s)

KOWALSKI, LEE ANNE

Examiner

Doug Hutton

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20020227.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 19 November 2004, Applicant amended Claims 1, 6-7, 15-19, 22, 23, 28-29, 35-41, 44, 45, 50-51, 57-63 and 66, added new Claim 10, cancelled Claims 6 and 7, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 20 August 2004.

The objections to the claims previously set forth are withdrawn. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, previously set forth are withdrawn. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16, 19-38, 41-60 and 63-66 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwick, Gordon, **Special Edition Using Microsoft Outlook 2002** (Que Publishing, 1 May 2001), in view of Rand et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0080528 A1.

Claim 1:

Padwick discloses a computer-implemented method for identifying and distinguishing words contained within an electronic message (see Chapter 28 –

Creating and Using Rules, "*Using the Rules Wizard to Manage Incoming Messages*"

Pages 1-16 of 16 – Padwick discloses this limitation in that Outlook includes an "Rules Wizard" tool that allows the user to search emails for a particular term or phrase), comprising the steps of:

- comparing, in a computer, message terms in an electronic message to significant terms stored by the computer in an online registry to identify any of the message terms in the electronic message that match the significant terms stored in the online registry (see Figure 28.7; see Pages 1-11 of 16 – Padwick discloses this limitation in that the "Rules Wizard" tool allows the user to create rules to filter emails based on whether user-specified terms are in the emails. Every rule created is stored on the computer, so that the rules may be subsequently applied to emails. Thus, the user-specified terms are "stored" by an "online registry."); and
- identifying, in the computer, the matched message terms and indicating their significance to a reader by sending electronic messages that include any matched significant message terms to a folder (see Figure 28.8; see Pages 1-11 of 16 – Padwick discloses this limitation in that the "Rules Wizard" tool allows the user to specify that emails satisfying a rule are moved to a particular folder. By moving emails that include user-specified terms to a particular folder, Padwick "identifies the matched message terms" and "indicates their significance to a reader.").

Padwick fails to expressly disclose:

- *making*, in the computer, *alterations* to the electronic message to identify the matched message terms and to indicate their significance to a reader.

Rand teaches a computer-implemented method for identifying and distinguishing words contained within an electronic message (see Figures 1 and 3; see Paragraphs 0015 and 0049 – Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system includes an “Keyword Search” tool that allows the user to search documents for a particular term or phrase), comprising the steps of:

- comparing, in a computer, message terms in an electronic message to significant terms to identify any of the message terms in the electronic message that match the significant terms (see Figure 3; see Paragraph 0049 – Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system includes a “search” function, which generates a list of documents that include user-specified search terms); and
- making, in the computer, alterations to the electronic message to identify the matched message terms and to indicate their significance to a reader (see Paragraph 0049 – Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system allows the user to click on any of the documents in the list and, upon selection of a listed document by the user, displays the document with the highlighted search term. By highlighting the search terms, Rand “identifies” the matched message terms and “indicates their significance.”),

for the purpose of calling the user's attention to the search terms and clearly indicating the location of the search terms in the document to the user.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, to include the step of:

- making, in the computer, alterations to the electronic message to identify the matched message terms and to indicate their significance to a reader, for the purpose of calling the user's attention to the search terms and clearly indicating the location of the search terms in the document to the user, as taught in Rand.

Claim 2:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the electronic message is an authored electronic message (Padwick discloses this limitation in that the searched emails are "electronic messages" that are "authored" by the computer user who wrote them).

Claim 3:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the electronic message is received electronic message (Padwick discloses this limitation in that the searched emails are "electronic messages" that are "received" by the computer user to whom they were addressed).

Claim 4:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the significant terms are determined based upon a reader profile (see Chapter 28 – Creating and Using Rules; “Using the Rules Wizard to Manage Incoming Messages” and “Creating Rules for Outgoing Messages” – Padwick discloses this limitation in that Outlook includes a “Rules Wizard” that allows the user to create rules for processing incoming emails for the “reader”; these rules comprise the “reader profile” that determines the “significant terms”).

Claim 5:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the significant terms are determined based upon a author profile (Padwick discloses this limitation in that Outlook includes a “Rules Wizard” that allows the user to create rules for processing outgoing emails for the “author”; these rules comprise the “author profile” that determines the “significant terms”).

Claim 6:

Padwick, in view of Rand, fails to expressly disclose:

- matched message terms that are identified based upon a reader profile.

However, selecting a particular color or font for display of the located search terms was a design choice that was well-known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Rand expressly taught “highlighting” the located search terms, but

did not disclose the particular color in which the term is highlighted and whether the color and/or font could be changed by the user. Changing the font and/or color of text in an electronic document was well-known at the time the invention was made by even ordinary computer users. At the time the invention was made, those of ordinary skill in the art – computer programmers – would have known how to design a search tool so a user could select the particular color and/or font in which the located search term was displayed for the purpose of aesthetics.

Additionally, Padwick disclosed a Rules Wizard that allowed the user to compose multiple processing rules that are applied to each received email. Thus, two rules could have been written to locate two different search requests for received emails and display each located term in different colors and/or fonts for the purpose of distinguishing the different search requests within each email. The different located terms displayed in different colors and/or fonts would have constituted “matched significant message terms” that are identified base upon a “reader profile.”

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, in view of Rand, to include matched message terms that are identified based upon a reader profile for the purposes of aesthetics and distinguishing the different search requests within each email.

Claim 7:

Padwick, in view of Rand, fails to expressly disclose:

- matched message terms that are identified based upon an author profile.

However, selecting a particular color or font for display of the located search terms was a design choice that was well-known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Rand expressly taught "highlighting" the located search terms, but did not disclose the particular color in which the term is highlighted and whether the color and/or font could be changed by the user. Changing the font and/or color of text in an electronic document was well-known at the time the invention was made by even ordinary computer users. At the time the invention was made, those of ordinary skill in the art – computer programmers – would have known how to design a search tool so a user could select the particular color and/or font in which the located search term was displayed for the purpose of aesthetics.

Additionally, Padwick disclosed a Rules Wizard that allowed the user to compose multiple processing rules that are applied to each sent email. Thus, two rules could have been written to locate two different search requests for sent emails and display each located term in different colors and/or fonts for the purpose of distinguishing the different search requests within each email. The different located terms displayed in different colors and/or fonts would have constituted "matched message terms" that are identified base upon an "author profile."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, in view of Rand, to include matched message terms that are identified based upon a author profile

for the purposes of aesthetics and distinguishing the different search requests within each email.

Claim 8:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, further comprising the step of collecting and storing significant terms in the online registry (see Chapter 28 – Creating and Using Rule; *“Using the Rules Wizard to Manage Incoming Messages”* and *“Creating Rules for Outgoing Messages”* – Padwick discloses this limitation in that Outlook includes a “Rules Wizard” that allows the user to create and save rules for searching incoming or outgoing emails for particular terms; thus, the rules constitute an “online registry” of “significant terms”).

Claim 9:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the step of collecting and storing comprises a user selecting significant terms (Padwick discloses this limitation in that Outlook includes a “Rules Wizard” that allows the user to create and save rules for searching incoming or outgoing emails for particular terms; thus, the user “selects significant terms”).

Claim 10:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 8, wherein the step of collecting and storing comprises importing significant terms (see Chapter 28 – Creating and Using

Rule; "*Managing Rules*" – Padwick discloses this limitation in that a set of rules, for searching incoming or outgoing emails for particular terms, can be imported from a file).

Claim 11:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 10, wherein significant terms are imported from an address book (Padwick discloses this limitation in that a set of rules, for searching incoming or outgoing emails for particular terms, can be imported from a file; a "file" includes an address book).

Claim 12:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 10, wherein significant terms are imported from a database (Padwick discloses this limitation in that a set of rules, for searching incoming or outgoing emails for particular terms, can be imported from a file; a "file" includes a database).

Claim 13:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein the significant terms comprise names of people, product terms or key words in a user's field (Padwick discloses this limitation in that the Rules Wizard allows the user to select the search terms, which may include "names of people"; for example, see Figure 28.4).

Art Unit: 2176

Claims 14-16:

Padwick, in view of Rand, fails to expressly disclose:

- making alterations to the electronic message comprises making the matched message terms a different color, a different font effect, or a different font type.

However, selecting a particular color, font effect, or font type for displaying the located search terms was a design choice that was well-known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Rand expressly taught “highlighting” the located search terms, but did not disclose the particular color in which the term is highlighted and whether the color, font effect, and/or font type could be changed by the user.

Changing the font effect, font type, and/or color of text in an electronic document was well-known at the time the invention was made by even ordinary computer users. At the time the invention was made, those of ordinary skill in the art – computer programmers – would have known how to design a search tool so a user could select the particular color, font effect, and/or font type in which the located search term was displayed for the purpose of aesthetics.

Additionally, Padwick disclosed a Rules Wizard that allowed the user to compose multiple processing rules that are applied to each sent email. Thus, two rules could have been written to locate two different search requests for sent emails and display each located term in different colors, font effects, and/or font types, for the purpose of distinguishing the different search requests within each email.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, in view of

Rand, to include making alterations to the electronic message comprises making the matched message terms a different color, a different font effect, or a different font type, for the purposes of aesthetics and distinguishing the different search requests within each email.

Claim 19:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein identifying where the alterations to the matched message terms, taught by Rand, are to be performed according to a user setting (Padwick discloses this limitation in that the Rules Wizard allows the user to select the search terms; thus, making the search term "distinct" is performed "according to a user setting").

Claim 20:

Padwick discloses the method of Claim 19, wherein the significant terms are categorized and the user setting is based upon a category of the significant term (Padwick discloses this limitation in that the Rules Wizard allows the user to select the search terms and process email messages containing each different search term in a particular way; for example, Outlook can search for all emails that include the term "deadline" and send those emails to a certain folder, or Outlook can search for all emails that include the term "office party" and delete those emails; thus, the significant terms are "categorized" and the user setting processes emails having the significant terms "based on a category of the significant term").

Claim 21:

Padwick fails to expressly disclose displaying the electronic message if the end of the electronic messages as been reached.

Rand teaches a method for identifying and distinguishing words contained within an electronic message (see Figures 1 and 3; see Paragraphs 0015 and 0049 –

Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system includes an “Keyword Search” tool that allows the user to search documents for a particular term or phrase), comprising the step of:

- displaying the electronic message if the end of the electronic messages as been reached (see Paragraph 0049 – Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system allows the user to click on any of the documents in the list and, upon selection of a listed document by the user, displays the document with the highlighted search term; thus, the electronic document processing system has scanned the document for the significant term and displays the document “if the end of the electronic messages as been reached”),

for the purpose of indicating the location of the search terms in the document to the user.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, to include the step of displaying the electronic message if the end of the electronic messages as been reached for the purpose of indicating the location of the search terms in the document to the user, as taught in Rand.

Claim 22:

Padwick fails to expressly disclose querying a user before making alterations to the electronic message.

Rand teaches a method for identifying and distinguishing words contained within an electronic message (see Figures 1 and 3; see Paragraphs 0015 and 0049 – Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system includes an “Keyword Search” tool that allows the user to search documents for a particular term or phrase), comprising the step of:

- querying a user before making alterations to the electronic message (see Figures 1 and 3; see Paragraphs 0015 and 0049 – Rand teaches this limitation in that the electronic document display system allows the user to search the document for particular terms and distinctly displays those terms; thus, the electronic document processing system “queries the user before making alterations to the electronic message”),

for the purpose of indicating the location of the search terms in the document to the user.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, to include the step of querying a user before making alterations to the electronic message, for the purpose of indicating the location of the search terms in the document to the user, as taught in Rand.

Claims 23-38 and 41-44:

These claims merely recite an apparatus for performing the method of Claims 1-16 and 19-22. Padwick discloses an "electronic message processor" (Claim 23, Line 3) and Rand teaches an "electronic message editor" (Claim 23, Line 6).

Thus, Claims 23-38 and 41-44 are rejected using the same rationale used in the above rejections for Claims 1-16 and 19-22, respectively.

Claims 45-60 and 63-66:

These claims merely recite computer software for performing the method of Claims 1-16 and 19-22. Both Padwick and Rand operate via computer software.

Thus, Claims 45-60 and 63-66 are rejected using the same rationale used in the above rejections for Claims 1-16 and 19-22, respectively.

Claims 17 and 18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwick, in view of Rand, and further in view of Abu-Hakima et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0020749 A1.

Claim 17:

As indicated in the above discussion, Padwick, in view of Rand, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 1.

Padwick, in view of Rand, fails to expressly disclose:

- inserting an object into the electronic message near the matched message term.

Abu-Hakima teaches a method for identifying and distinguishing words contained within an electronic message (see Paragraphs 0001 and 0006-0008 – Abu-Hakima teaches this limitation in that the electronic document processor searches for concepts and displays those concepts), comprising the steps of:

- inserting an object into the electronic message near the matched message term (see Figure 4; see Paragraph 0067 – Abu-Hakima teaches this limitation in that the electronic document processor displays the concept within an icon), for the purpose of calling the user's attention to the message in which the matched significant message term is located.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, in view of Rand, to include inserting an object into the electronic message near the matched message term, for the purpose of calling the user's attention to the message in which the matched significant message term is located, as taught by Abu-Hakima.

Claim 18:

Padwick, in view of Rand, fails to expressly disclose:

- an object that comprises an image, a sound file, an icon, a link or a video.

Abu-Hakima teaches a method for identifying and distinguishing words contained within an electronic message (see Paragraphs 0001 and 0006-0008 – Abu-Hakima teaches this limitation in that the electronic document processor searches for concepts and displays those concepts), comprising the steps of:

- selecting an object that comprises an image, a sound file, an icon, a link or a video (see Figure 4; see Paragraph 0067 – Abu-Hakima teaches this limitation in that the electronic document processor displays the concept within an icon), for the purpose of calling the user's attention to the message in which the matched significant message term is located.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Padwick, in view of Rand, to include selecting an object from the group consisting of an image, a sound file, an icon, a link and a video for the purpose of calling the user's attention to the message in which the matched significant message term is located, as taught by Abu-Hakima.

Claims 39 and 40:

These claims merely recite an apparatus for performing the method of Claims 17 and 18. Padwick discloses an "electronic message processor" (Claim 23, Line 3) and Rand teaches an "electronic message editor" (Claim 23, Line 6).

Thus, Claims 39 and 40 are rejected using the same rationale used in the above rejections for Claims 17 and 18, respectively.

Claims 61 and 62:

These claims merely recite computer software for performing the method of Claims 17 and 18. Both Padwick and Rand operate via computer software.

Thus, Claims 61 and 62 are rejected using the same rationale used in the above rejections for Claims 17 and 18, respectively.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 19 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Arguments for Claims 1, 23 and 45:

Applicant argues that the references fail to disclose making alterations to an electronic message to identify message terms in the electronic message that match significant terms stored in the online registry, because the references merely search emails or other text for a particular term or phrase and then highlight the display of that particular term or phrase when found. Thus, Applicant argues, the email, message or text itself is not altered. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 11, fourth full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The relevant claim limitation reads: “making, in the computer, alterations to the electronic message to identify the matched message terms and to indicate their significance to a reader” (see Claim 1, Lines 7-8). This language, given its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the Specification, reads on the prior art, as indicated in the following discussion.

The Specification of the present invention recites: "in another embodiment of the invention, electronic message recipients may specify key words that they want to have identified in the electronic messages that they receive when they open the messages to read them, instead of relying on the author having specified them when the author sent the message." In this way, "the recipient could turn on the invention to look for and highlight her own name or certain other names or words that she's specified in a personal 'dictionary' and automatically see those words easily." For example, "[w]ith an embodiment of this invention in his electronic message program, [David] could have registered a set of key words that includes his name ('David'), and the terms 'meeting' and 'Standards', so that he can easily see his name in any messages that come in and determine whether there might be an issue for him or his team and for meetings. So, when the message arrives and he opens it, the words 'meeting', 'Standards', and 'David' will be highlighted and he can see them easily with the items that are important for him and his team." See *Specification* – Page 19, second full paragraph through Page 20, first partial paragraph.

In other words, the present invention filters incoming emails for user-specified terms or phrases and highlights the user-specified terms or phrases when the user opens an email satisfying the filtering criteria. This is precisely what is disclosed/taught by the combination of Padwick and Rand. As explained in the above rejection for Claim 1, Padwick discloses filtering incoming emails for user-specified terms or phrases and placing those emails satisfying the filtering criteria into a user-specified folder, whereas Rand teaches filtering electronic documents for user-specified terms or phrases and

highlighting the user-specified terms or phrases when the user opens those documents satisfying the filtering criteria. As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, the examiner has provided proper motivation to combine the teachings of Rand with the disclosure of Padwick.

Accordingly, Padwick, in view of Rand, discloses/teaches "making, in the computer, alterations to the electronic message to identify the matched message terms and to indicate their significance to a reader."

Applicant argues that the references fail to disclose an online registry that stores significant terms, because the reference merely describe search tools that include dialogs and rules wizards that execute rules. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 11, fifth full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

As explained in the above rejection for Claim 1, Padwick discloses this limitation in that the "Rules Wizard" tool allows the user to create rules to filter emails based on whether user-specified terms are in the emails. Every rule created is stored on the computer, so that the rules may be subsequently applied to emails. Thus, the user-specified terms are "stored" by an "online registry."

Accordingly, Padwick discloses an "online registry."

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
July 20, 2004



**DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100**